

ABUSY DAY AT ALBANY.

SENATE TAKES ACTION ON MANY IMPORTANT MEASURES.

[BY TELEGRAPH TO THE TRIBUNE.] Albany, March 26.—The Senate passed today the bill authorizing the city authorities of New-York and Buffalo, acting through the New-York and Buffalo Railroad Commission, to enlarge their respective territories in these cities. It is the plan of the New-York Central, as is well known, to construct an underground loop of gigantic size beneath the Grand Central Station for the use of its suburban trains. This plan is part of that to do away with the danger of accidents in the Fourteenth street tunnel.

Opposition to the bill came today only from Senator Grady, who said the measure was one which had been agreed upon by Mayor Low and the railroad company concerned. Two of the Buffalo Senators voted against it. The bill passed by a vote of 35 to 2. Among the New-York Senators who voted for it were Senators Albano, Cullen, Martin, McCarren, Stearns, Wagner, Sen. Sen. Davis, Sen. Hendon, Foley, Grady, Hill and Ramoerger, voted against it.

The Senate then took up for consideration Assemblyman Apgar's bill providing that on and after May 1, 1905, it shall be unlawful to use steam as a motive power for locomotives in the Fourteenth street tunnel. The bill was passed by a vote of 35 to 2. Among the New-York Senators who voted for it were Senators Albano, Cullen, Martin, McCarren, Stearns, Wagner, Sen. Sen. Davis, Sen. Hendon, Foley, Grady, Hill and Ramoerger, voted against it.

The Senate also passed several other bills of importance in relation to the city of New-York. One, introduced by Mr. Kelsey, authorizes the acquisition of what property by the city of New-York. The bill was passed by a vote of 35 to 2. Among the New-York Senators who voted for it were Senators Albano, Cullen, Martin, McCarren, Stearns, Wagner, Sen. Sen. Davis, Sen. Hendon, Foley, Grady, Hill and Ramoerger, voted against it.

Another bill, introduced by Mr. Kelsey, authorizes the acquisition of what property by the city of New-York. The bill was passed by a vote of 35 to 2. Among the New-York Senators who voted for it were Senators Albano, Cullen, Martin, McCarren, Stearns, Wagner, Sen. Sen. Davis, Sen. Hendon, Foley, Grady, Hill and Ramoerger, voted against it.

The Senate also passed several other bills of importance in relation to the city of New-York. One, introduced by Mr. Kelsey, authorizes the acquisition of what property by the city of New-York. The bill was passed by a vote of 35 to 2. Among the New-York Senators who voted for it were Senators Albano, Cullen, Martin, McCarren, Stearns, Wagner, Sen. Sen. Davis, Sen. Hendon, Foley, Grady, Hill and Ramoerger, voted against it.

Another bill, introduced by Mr. Kelsey, authorizes the acquisition of what property by the city of New-York. The bill was passed by a vote of 35 to 2. Among the New-York Senators who voted for it were Senators Albano, Cullen, Martin, McCarren, Stearns, Wagner, Sen. Sen. Davis, Sen. Hendon, Foley, Grady, Hill and Ramoerger, voted against it.

The Senate also passed several other bills of importance in relation to the city of New-York. One, introduced by Mr. Kelsey, authorizes the acquisition of what property by the city of New-York. The bill was passed by a vote of 35 to 2. Among the New-York Senators who voted for it were Senators Albano, Cullen, Martin, McCarren, Stearns, Wagner, Sen. Sen. Davis, Sen. Hendon, Foley, Grady, Hill and Ramoerger, voted against it.

Another bill, introduced by Mr. Kelsey, authorizes the acquisition of what property by the city of New-York. The bill was passed by a vote of 35 to 2. Among the New-York Senators who voted for it were Senators Albano, Cullen, Martin, McCarren, Stearns, Wagner, Sen. Sen. Davis, Sen. Hendon, Foley, Grady, Hill and Ramoerger, voted against it.

The Senate also passed several other bills of importance in relation to the city of New-York. One, introduced by Mr. Kelsey, authorizes the acquisition of what property by the city of New-York. The bill was passed by a vote of 35 to 2. Among the New-York Senators who voted for it were Senators Albano, Cullen, Martin, McCarren, Stearns, Wagner, Sen. Sen. Davis, Sen. Hendon, Foley, Grady, Hill and Ramoerger, voted against it.

Another bill, introduced by Mr. Kelsey, authorizes the acquisition of what property by the city of New-York. The bill was passed by a vote of 35 to 2. Among the New-York Senators who voted for it were Senators Albano, Cullen, Martin, McCarren, Stearns, Wagner, Sen. Sen. Davis, Sen. Hendon, Foley, Grady, Hill and Ramoerger, voted against it.

The Senate also passed several other bills of importance in relation to the city of New-York. One, introduced by Mr. Kelsey, authorizes the acquisition of what property by the city of New-York. The bill was passed by a vote of 35 to 2. Among the New-York Senators who voted for it were Senators Albano, Cullen, Martin, McCarren, Stearns, Wagner, Sen. Sen. Davis, Sen. Hendon, Foley, Grady, Hill and Ramoerger, voted against it.

Another bill, introduced by Mr. Kelsey, authorizes the acquisition of what property by the city of New-York. The bill was passed by a vote of 35 to 2. Among the New-York Senators who voted for it were Senators Albano, Cullen, Martin, McCarren, Stearns, Wagner, Sen. Sen. Davis, Sen. Hendon, Foley, Grady, Hill and Ramoerger, voted against it.

The Senate also passed several other bills of importance in relation to the city of New-York. One, introduced by Mr. Kelsey, authorizes the acquisition of what property by the city of New-York. The bill was passed by a vote of 35 to 2. Among the New-York Senators who voted for it were Senators Albano, Cullen, Martin, McCarren, Stearns, Wagner, Sen. Sen. Davis, Sen. Hendon, Foley, Grady, Hill and Ramoerger, voted against it.

Another bill, introduced by Mr. Kelsey, authorizes the acquisition of what property by the city of New-York. The bill was passed by a vote of 35 to 2. Among the New-York Senators who voted for it were Senators Albano, Cullen, Martin, McCarren, Stearns, Wagner, Sen. Sen. Davis, Sen. Hendon, Foley, Grady, Hill and Ramoerger, voted against it.

The Senate also passed several other bills of importance in relation to the city of New-York. One, introduced by Mr. Kelsey, authorizes the acquisition of what property by the city of New-York. The bill was passed by a vote of 35 to 2. Among the New-York Senators who voted for it were Senators Albano, Cullen, Martin, McCarren, Stearns, Wagner, Sen. Sen. Davis, Sen. Hendon, Foley, Grady, Hill and Ramoerger, voted against it.

Another bill, introduced by Mr. Kelsey, authorizes the acquisition of what property by the city of New-York. The bill was passed by a vote of 35 to 2. Among the New-York Senators who voted for it were Senators Albano, Cullen, Martin, McCarren, Stearns, Wagner, Sen. Sen. Davis, Sen. Hendon, Foley, Grady, Hill and Ramoerger, voted against it.

The Senate also passed several other bills of importance in relation to the city of New-York. One, introduced by Mr. Kelsey, authorizes the acquisition of what property by the city of New-York. The bill was passed by a vote of 35 to 2. Among the New-York Senators who voted for it were Senators Albano, Cullen, Martin, McCarren, Stearns, Wagner, Sen. Sen. Davis, Sen. Hendon, Foley, Grady, Hill and Ramoerger, voted against it.

Another bill, introduced by Mr. Kelsey, authorizes the acquisition of what property by the city of New-York. The bill was passed by a vote of 35 to 2. Among the New-York Senators who voted for it were Senators Albano, Cullen, Martin, McCarren, Stearns, Wagner, Sen. Sen. Davis, Sen. Hendon, Foley, Grady, Hill and Ramoerger, voted against it.

The Senate also passed several other bills of importance in relation to the city of New-York. One, introduced by Mr. Kelsey, authorizes the acquisition of what property by the city of New-York. The bill was passed by a vote of 35 to 2. Among the New-York Senators who voted for it were Senators Albano, Cullen, Martin, McCarren, Stearns, Wagner, Sen. Sen. Davis, Sen. Hendon, Foley, Grady, Hill and Ramoerger, voted against it.

Another bill, introduced by Mr. Kelsey, authorizes the acquisition of what property by the city of New-York. The bill was passed by a vote of 35 to 2. Among the New-York Senators who voted for it were Senators Albano, Cullen, Martin, McCarren, Stearns, Wagner, Sen. Sen. Davis, Sen. Hendon, Foley, Grady, Hill and Ramoerger, voted against it.

The Senate also passed several other bills of importance in relation to the city of New-York. One, introduced by Mr. Kelsey, authorizes the acquisition of what property by the city of New-York. The bill was passed by a vote of 35 to 2. Among the New-York Senators who voted for it were Senators Albano, Cullen, Martin, McCarren, Stearns, Wagner, Sen. Sen. Davis, Sen. Hendon, Foley, Grady, Hill and Ramoerger, voted against it.

Another bill, introduced by Mr. Kelsey, authorizes the acquisition of what property by the city of New-York. The bill was passed by a vote of 35 to 2. Among the New-York Senators who voted for it were Senators Albano, Cullen, Martin, McCarren, Stearns, Wagner, Sen. Sen. Davis, Sen. Hendon, Foley, Grady, Hill and Ramoerger, voted against it.

The Senate also passed several other bills of importance in relation to the city of New-York. One, introduced by Mr. Kelsey, authorizes the acquisition of what property by the city of New-York. The bill was passed by a vote of 35 to 2. Among the New-York Senators who voted for it were Senators Albano, Cullen, Martin, McCarren, Stearns, Wagner, Sen. Sen. Davis, Sen. Hendon, Foley, Grady, Hill and Ramoerger, voted against it.

Another bill, introduced by Mr. Kelsey, authorizes the acquisition of what property by the city of New-York. The bill was passed by a vote of 35 to 2. Among the New-York Senators who voted for it were Senators Albano, Cullen, Martin, McCarren, Stearns, Wagner, Sen. Sen. Davis, Sen. Hendon, Foley, Grady, Hill and Ramoerger, voted against it.

The Senate also passed several other bills of importance in relation to the city of New-York. One, introduced by Mr. Kelsey, authorizes the acquisition of what property by the city of New-York. The bill was passed by a vote of 35 to 2. Among the New-York Senators who voted for it were Senators Albano, Cullen, Martin, McCarren, Stearns, Wagner, Sen. Sen. Davis, Sen. Hendon, Foley, Grady, Hill and Ramoerger, voted against it.

Another bill, introduced by Mr. Kelsey, authorizes the acquisition of what property by the city of New-York. The bill was passed by a vote of 35 to 2. Among the New-York Senators who voted for it were Senators Albano, Cullen, Martin, McCarren, Stearns, Wagner, Sen. Sen. Davis, Sen. Hendon, Foley, Grady, Hill and Ramoerger, voted against it.

The Senate also passed several other bills of importance in relation to the city of New-York. One, introduced by Mr. Kelsey, authorizes the acquisition of what property by the city of New-York. The bill was passed by a vote of 35 to 2. Among the New-York Senators who voted for it were Senators Albano, Cullen, Martin, McCarren, Stearns, Wagner, Sen. Sen. Davis, Sen. Hendon, Foley, Grady, Hill and Ramoerger, voted against it.

Another bill, introduced by Mr. Kelsey, authorizes the acquisition of what property by the city of New-York. The bill was passed by a vote of 35 to 2. Among the New-York Senators who voted for it were Senators Albano, Cullen, Martin, McCarren, Stearns, Wagner, Sen. Sen. Davis, Sen. Hendon, Foley, Grady, Hill and Ramoerger, voted against it.

The Senate also passed several other bills of importance in relation to the city of New-York. One, introduced by Mr. Kelsey, authorizes the acquisition of what property by the city of New-York. The bill was passed by a vote of 35 to 2. Among the New-York Senators who voted for it were Senators Albano, Cullen, Martin, McCarren, Stearns, Wagner, Sen. Sen. Davis, Sen. Hendon, Foley, Grady, Hill and Ramoerger, voted against it.

Another bill, introduced by Mr. Kelsey, authorizes the acquisition of what property by the city of New-York. The bill was passed by a vote of 35 to 2. Among the New-York Senators who voted for it were Senators Albano, Cullen, Martin, McCarren, Stearns, Wagner, Sen. Sen. Davis, Sen. Hendon, Foley, Grady, Hill and Ramoerger, voted against it.

R. T. COMMISSION WILL RULE.

PENNSYLVANIA TUNNEL BILL PASSED BY ASSEMBLY—DEMOCRATS STAND AGAINST MEASURE.

Albany, March 23 (Special).—The bill of Senator Stranahan, which provides that the operation of the Pennsylvania Railroad Company's proposed tunnel under the island of Manhattan shall be under the supervision and direction of the Rapid Transit Commission, passed the Assembly this morning by a vote of 196 yeas to 39 nays. The bill was accompanied by an emergency message from the Governor and a letter from Mayor Low in his behalf.

It was somewhat of a surprise to the New-York delegation that the bill was attacked by several Republican members from that city, who did not hesitate to denounce Mayor Low in their opposition to the measure. On the floor call it was found that all the Democrats, with the exception of Assemblymen Grady, McInerney and McKenney, voted against the bill, together with the following Republicans: J. A. Allen, Bennett, Newcomb and Finch.

Assemblyman Bennett attacked the bill in a speech that was finally cut short by the Speaker on the time limit. Mr. Bennett said in part: "Tammany Hall never conceived of such an outrageous bill as the one that we have before us. Tammany would not have dared to bring such a bill to the Assembly. It is a disgrace to the city of Albany. It is the property body to pass on the franchise of the city, and not this Rapid Transit Commission, which is responsible to no one."

Assemblyman J. A. Allen denounced Mayor Low by saying: "This bill has been sent here by a man who is supposed to be a reform Mayor. He has, however, repudiated his claim to that name. He was elected on a platform of home rule, but this measure which he has sent to us is an open violation of the fundamental principles of home rule."

Assemblyman Newcomb, of the XXIIIrd District, New-York, also attacked the bill on the ground that the Board of Rapid Transit Commissioners was not the body to be responsible for the operation of a corporate enterprise. The Tammany members who spoke against the bill were Assemblymen Fitzgerald, Duross, Sanders and Smith, of New-York.

Mr. Kelsey, chairman of the Assembly Cities Committee, in a short speech, opposed the bill on the ground that it was an open violation of the fundamental principles of home rule. He said that the membership of the Rapid Transit Commission was made up of men of high integrity and that it was the property body to pass on the franchise of the city, and not this Rapid Transit Commission, which is responsible to no one.

Assemblyman Newcomb, of the XXIIIrd District, New-York, also attacked the bill on the ground that the Board of Rapid Transit Commissioners was not the body to be responsible for the operation of a corporate enterprise. The Tammany members who spoke against the bill were Assemblymen Fitzgerald, Duross, Sanders and Smith, of New-York.

Mr. Kelsey, chairman of the Assembly Cities Committee, in a short speech, opposed the bill on the ground that it was an open violation of the fundamental principles of home rule. He said that the membership of the Rapid Transit Commission was made up of men of high integrity and that it was the property body to pass on the franchise of the city, and not this Rapid Transit Commission, which is responsible to no one.

Assemblyman Newcomb, of the XXIIIrd District, New-York, also attacked the bill on the ground that the Board of Rapid Transit Commissioners was not the body to be responsible for the operation of a corporate enterprise. The Tammany members who spoke against the bill were Assemblymen Fitzgerald, Duross, Sanders and Smith, of New-York.

Mr. Kelsey, chairman of the Assembly Cities Committee, in a short speech, opposed the bill on the ground that it was an open violation of the fundamental principles of home rule. He said that the membership of the Rapid Transit Commission was made up of men of high integrity and that it was the property body to pass on the franchise of the city, and not this Rapid Transit Commission, which is responsible to no one.

Assemblyman Newcomb, of the XXIIIrd District, New-York, also attacked the bill on the ground that the Board of Rapid Transit Commissioners was not the body to be responsible for the operation of a corporate enterprise. The Tammany members who spoke against the bill were Assemblymen Fitzgerald, Duross, Sanders and Smith, of New-York.

Mr. Kelsey, chairman of the Assembly Cities Committee, in a short speech, opposed the bill on the ground that it was an open violation of the fundamental principles of home rule. He said that the membership of the Rapid Transit Commission was made up of men of high integrity and that it was the property body to pass on the franchise of the city, and not this Rapid Transit Commission, which is responsible to no one.

Assemblyman Newcomb, of the XXIIIrd District, New-York, also attacked the bill on the ground that the Board of Rapid Transit Commissioners was not the body to be responsible for the operation of a corporate enterprise. The Tammany members who spoke against the bill were Assemblymen Fitzgerald, Duross, Sanders and Smith, of New-York.

Mr. Kelsey, chairman of the Assembly Cities Committee, in a short speech, opposed the bill on the ground that it was an open violation of the fundamental principles of home rule. He said that the membership of the Rapid Transit Commission was made up of men of high integrity and that it was the property body to pass on the franchise of the city, and not this Rapid Transit Commission, which is responsible to no one.

Assemblyman Newcomb, of the XXIIIrd District, New-York, also attacked the bill on the ground that the Board of Rapid Transit Commissioners was not the body to be responsible for the operation of a corporate enterprise. The Tammany members who spoke against the bill were Assemblymen Fitzgerald, Duross, Sanders and Smith, of New-York.

Mr. Kelsey, chairman of the Assembly Cities Committee, in a short speech, opposed the bill on the ground that it was an open violation of the fundamental principles of home rule. He said that the membership of the Rapid Transit Commission was made up of men of high integrity and that it was the property body to pass on the franchise of the city, and not this Rapid Transit Commission, which is responsible to no one.

Assemblyman Newcomb, of the XXIIIrd District, New-York, also attacked the bill on the ground that the Board of Rapid Transit Commissioners was not the body to be responsible for the operation of a corporate enterprise. The Tammany members who spoke against the bill were Assemblymen Fitzgerald, Duross, Sanders and Smith, of New-York.

Mr. Kelsey, chairman of the Assembly Cities Committee, in a short speech, opposed the bill on the ground that it was an open violation of the fundamental principles of home rule. He said that the membership of the Rapid Transit Commission was made up of men of high integrity and that it was the property body to pass on the franchise of the city, and not this Rapid Transit Commission, which is responsible to no one.

Assemblyman Newcomb, of the XXIIIrd District, New-York, also attacked the bill on the ground that the Board of Rapid Transit Commissioners was not the body to be responsible for the operation of a corporate enterprise. The Tammany members who spoke against the bill were Assemblymen Fitzgerald, Duross, Sanders and Smith, of New-York.

Mr. Kelsey, chairman of the Assembly Cities Committee, in a short speech, opposed the bill on the ground that it was an open violation of the fundamental principles of home rule. He said that the membership of the Rapid Transit Commission was made up of men of high integrity and that it was the property body to pass on the franchise of the city, and not this Rapid Transit Commission, which is responsible to no one.

Assemblyman Newcomb, of the XXIIIrd District, New-York, also attacked the bill on the ground that the Board of Rapid Transit Commissioners was not the body to be responsible for the operation of a corporate enterprise. The Tammany members who spoke against the bill were Assemblymen Fitzgerald, Duross, Sanders and Smith, of New-York.

Mr. Kelsey, chairman of the Assembly Cities Committee, in a short speech, opposed the bill on the ground that it was an open violation of the fundamental principles of home rule. He said that the membership of the Rapid Transit Commission was made up of men of high integrity and that it was the property body to pass on the franchise of the city, and not this Rapid Transit Commission, which is responsible to no one.

Assemblyman Newcomb, of the XXIIIrd District, New-York, also attacked the bill on the ground that the Board of Rapid Transit Commissioners was not the body to be responsible for the operation of a corporate enterprise. The Tammany members who spoke against the bill were Assemblymen Fitzgerald, Duross, Sanders and Smith, of New-York.

Mr. Kelsey, chairman of the Assembly Cities Committee, in a short speech, opposed the bill on the ground that it was an open violation of the fundamental principles of home rule. He said that the membership of the Rapid Transit Commission was made up of men of high integrity and that it was the property body to pass on the franchise of the city, and not this Rapid Transit Commission, which is responsible to no one.

Assemblyman Newcomb, of the XXIIIrd District, New-York, also attacked the bill on the ground that the Board of Rapid Transit Commissioners was not the body to be responsible for the operation of a corporate enterprise. The Tammany members who spoke against the bill were Assemblymen Fitzgerald, Duross, Sanders and Smith, of New-York.

Mr. Kelsey, chairman of the Assembly Cities Committee, in a short speech, opposed the bill on the ground that it was an open violation of the fundamental principles of home rule. He said that the membership of the Rapid Transit Commission was made up of men of high integrity and that it was the property body to pass on the franchise of the city, and not this Rapid Transit Commission, which is responsible to no one.

Assemblyman Newcomb, of the XXIIIrd District, New-York, also attacked the bill on the ground that the Board of Rapid Transit Commissioners was not the body to be responsible for the operation of a corporate enterprise. The Tammany members who spoke against the bill were Assemblymen Fitzgerald, Duross, Sanders and Smith, of New-York.

Mr. Kelsey, chairman of the Assembly Cities Committee, in a short speech, opposed the bill on the ground that it was an open violation of the fundamental principles of home rule. He said that the membership of the Rapid Transit Commission was made up of men of high integrity and that it was the property body to pass on the franchise of the city, and not this Rapid Transit Commission, which is responsible to no one.

Assemblyman Newcomb, of the XXIIIrd District, New-York, also attacked the bill on the ground that the Board of Rapid Transit Commissioners was not the body to be responsible for the operation of a corporate enterprise. The Tammany members who spoke against the bill were Assemblymen Fitzgerald, Duross, Sanders and Smith, of New-York.

Mr. Kelsey, chairman of the Assembly Cities Committee, in a short speech, opposed the bill on the ground that it was an open violation of the fundamental principles of home rule. He said that the membership of the Rapid Transit Commission was made up of men of high integrity and that it was the property body to pass on the franchise of the city, and not this Rapid Transit Commission, which is responsible to no one.

Assemblyman Newcomb, of the XXIIIrd District, New-York, also attacked the bill on the ground that the Board of Rapid Transit Commissioners was not the body to be responsible for the operation of a corporate enterprise. The Tammany members who spoke against the bill were Assemblymen Fitzgerald, Duross, Sanders and Smith, of New-York.

SHERIFF CASE MUST WAIT.

ODELL WILL NOT CALL EXTRA SESSION OF APPELLATE DIVISION.

STATE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION RECOGNIZES DIKE'S PAYROLL APPROVED.

Albany, March 26.—Governor Odell said tonight, when asked what decision had been made by the State authorities regarding the contest between Sheriff Dike of Kings County and ex-Sheriff Gudon:

"I thought yesterday of summoning an extraordinary session of the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court in the Second District to consider the matters in dispute between Mr. Dike and Mr. Gudon, but I did so under the mistaken impression that the court would not be in session until the middle of May. I have since learned that the court will meet on April 14, and therefore I have taken action toward calling it together before that time."

The State Civil Service Commission has decided to recognize Colonel Norman S. Dike as Sheriff of Kings County. The commission has approved the payroll of Sheriff Charles Gudon from March 1 to March 31 and Colonel Dike's payroll from March 11 to March 31.

GUDON IN THE COURTHOUSE.

JANITOR GIVES UP ROOM TO HIM—DEMAND FOR A JAIL REFUSED.

Charles Gudon yesterday opened offices on the ground floor of the Kings County Court House in Room No. 17, which had been used by him as a janitor, but was given up by him to Gudon, who, according to Justice Gaynor's decision, is Sheriff. When Gudon was asked how many employees he had with him, he replied:

"I have my chief clerk, Johnson, Deputy Sheriff, Murphy, and fifty other men, of course. Some of them are working over in Colonel Dike's office. They are all Sheriff's employees yet, as I have not discharged any of them. If I ask them to do something for me, in my own capacity, they refuse to do it, then I will discharge them. But I have given them no orders as yet. They are all attending to their work. I've got possession of this small room here, and I intend to stay here. It's a foothold, even if it is a little uncomfortable."

Colonel Norman S. Dike remarked yesterday that he had made up his mind to "stick it out." "It is nonsense," he continued, "for people to say that I have cold feet. My stock of courage is not coming out. The only development to-day was an application on the part of Mr. Wernberg. Mr. Gudon's counsel, he is not satisfied with the order issued by Justice Gaynor yesterday. You see it includes in its last paragraph a provision for a stay of proceedings. Now, Mr. Wernberg thinks that our side should have applied for the stay. We have acquiesced just to please him. It does not change the affair any. The stay is just as binding."

"Now it is up to Mr. Wernberg whether or not we have a speedy adjournment of the case in the Appellate Division. The session does not open until April 14. This would tie up the public's business for nearly a month. We desire, and have asked Mr. Wernberg to acquiesce, that application be made for an extraordinary session of the Appellate Division. The case could then go before that court as early as the beginning of next week. Then, inside of a week, a decision could be handed down. It should be done, and it is up to Mr. Wernberg. Without his co-operation in the application we are powerless."

"In the mean time, the business of this office shall go on as usual. We are doing our work and we expect to win the case. I am not going to help along a quick adjournment before the Appellate Division, Mr. Wernberg said. 'We will do nothing. Let Colonel Dike move if he wants to. It is up to him, and not to Gudon.'"

Before opening offices in the County Court House, Gudon went to Borough President Swanstrom and said that he was not going to accept the office of Sheriff of Kings County, he demanded that Mr. Swanstrom provide him with suitable offices and the use of a building for jail purposes. Mr. Swanstrom did not think he had the power to do what Gudon asked, and said his impression was that the power lay with the Sinking Fund Commission.

Gudon then sent a letter to the Sinking Fund Commission, which met yesterday, asking for rooms in the Kings County Court House as Sheriff of the county, and for rooms for a jail. Controller Grout moved that the quarters regularly assigned to the Sheriff of Kings County be continued. He said the Sinking Fund Commission had nothing to do with individuals, Counselor Mr. Gudon asked if he could have a certain part of the County Court House, without names, in order to get rooms. Mr. Grout smiled a rat and promptly moved to withdraw his resolution and lay Mr. Gudon's letter on the table. This was done.

GOVERNOR CAUSES OBJECTIONABLE AMENDMENTS TO BE CHANGED.

[BY TELEGRAPH TO THE TRIBUNE.] Albany, March 26.—Governor Odell declined to "stand for" the worthless amendments made to the Tenement House law of the State, and therefore the Assembly Committee on Rules tonight voted to place the bill on the calendar to-morrow with the objectionable features stricken out. It is understood that the Governor is attempting to get certain Brooklyn members to defeat the bill, inasmuch as it does not now contain the provisions asked for by the Brooklyn builders.

It is also understood that the Governor is attempting to get certain Brooklyn members to defeat the bill, inasmuch as it does not now contain the provisions asked for by the Brooklyn builders. It is also understood that the Governor is attempting to get certain Brooklyn members to defeat the bill, inasmuch as it does not now contain the provisions asked for by the Brooklyn builders.

It is also understood that the Governor is attempting to get certain Brooklyn members to defeat the bill, inasmuch as it does not now contain the provisions asked for by the Brooklyn builders. It is also understood that the Governor is attempting to get certain Brooklyn members to defeat the bill, inasmuch as it does not now contain the provisions asked for by the Brooklyn builders.

It is also understood that the Governor is attempting to get certain Brooklyn members to defeat the bill, inasmuch as it does not now contain the provisions asked for by the Brooklyn builders. It is also understood that the Governor is attempting to get certain Brooklyn members to defeat the bill, inasmuch as it does not now contain the provisions asked for by the Brooklyn builders.

It is also understood that the Governor is attempting to get certain Brooklyn members to defeat the bill, inasmuch as it does not now contain the provisions asked for by the Brooklyn builders. It is also understood that the Governor is attempting to get certain Brooklyn members to defeat the bill, inasmuch as it does not now contain the provisions asked for by the Brooklyn builders.

It is also understood that the Governor is attempting to get certain Brooklyn members to defeat the bill, inasmuch as it does not now contain the provisions asked for by the Brooklyn builders. It is also understood that the Governor is attempting to get certain Brooklyn members to defeat the bill, inasmuch as it does not now contain the provisions asked for by the Brooklyn builders.

It is also understood that the Governor is attempting to get certain Brooklyn members to defeat the bill, inasmuch as it does not now contain the provisions asked for by the Brooklyn builders. It is also understood that the Governor is attempting to get certain Brooklyn members to defeat the bill, inasmuch as it does not now contain the provisions asked for by the Brooklyn builders.

It is also understood that the Governor is attempting to get certain Brooklyn members to defeat the bill, inasmuch as it does not now contain the provisions asked for by the Brooklyn builders. It is also understood that the Governor is attempting to get certain Brooklyn members to defeat the bill, inasmuch as it does not now contain the provisions asked for by the Brooklyn builders.

It is also understood that the Governor is attempting to get certain Brooklyn members to defeat the bill, inasmuch as it does not now contain the provisions asked for by the Brooklyn builders. It is also understood that the Governor is attempting to get certain Brooklyn members to defeat the bill, inasmuch as it does not now contain the provisions asked for by the Brooklyn builders.

It is also understood that the Governor is attempting to get certain Brooklyn members to defeat the bill, inasmuch as it does not now contain the provisions asked for by the Brooklyn builders. It is also understood that the Governor is attempting to get certain Brooklyn members to defeat the bill, inasmuch as it does not now contain the provisions asked for by the Brooklyn builders.

It is also understood that the Governor is attempting to get certain Brooklyn members to defeat the bill, inasmuch as it does not now contain the provisions asked for by the Brooklyn builders. It is also understood that the Governor is attempting to get certain Brooklyn members to defeat the bill, inasmuch as it does not now contain the provisions asked for by the Brooklyn builders.

It is also understood that the Governor is attempting to get certain Brooklyn members to defeat the bill, inasmuch as it does not now contain the provisions asked for by the Brooklyn builders. It is also understood that the Governor is attempting to get certain Brooklyn members to defeat the bill, inasmuch as it does not now contain the provisions asked for by the Brooklyn builders.

It is also understood that the Governor is attempting to get certain Brooklyn members to defeat the bill, inasmuch as it does not now contain the provisions asked for by the Brooklyn builders. It is also understood that the Governor is attempting to get certain Brooklyn members to defeat the bill, inasmuch as it does not now contain the provisions asked for by the Brooklyn builders.

It is also understood that the Governor is attempting to get certain Brooklyn members to defeat the bill, inasmuch as it does not now contain the provisions asked for by the Brooklyn builders. It is also understood that the Governor is attempting to get certain Brooklyn members to defeat the bill, inasmuch as it does not now contain the provisions asked for by the Brooklyn builders.

It is also understood that the Governor is attempting to get certain Brooklyn members to defeat the bill, inasmuch as it does not now contain the provisions asked for by the Brooklyn builders. It is also understood that the Governor is attempting to get certain Brooklyn members to defeat the bill, inasmuch as it does not now contain the provisions asked for by the Brooklyn builders.

It is also understood that the Governor is attempting to get certain Brooklyn members to defeat the bill, inasmuch as it does not now contain the provisions asked for by the Brooklyn builders. It is also understood that the Governor is attempting to get certain Brooklyn members to defeat the bill, inasmuch as it does not now contain the provisions asked for by the Brooklyn builders.

It is also understood that the Governor is attempting to get certain Brooklyn members to defeat the bill, inasmuch as it does not now contain the provisions asked for by the Brooklyn builders. It is also understood that the Governor is attempting to get certain Brooklyn members to defeat the bill, inasmuch as it does not now contain the provisions asked for by the Brooklyn builders.

It is also understood that the Governor is attempting to get certain Brooklyn members to defeat the bill, inasmuch as it does not now contain the provisions asked for by the Brooklyn builders. It is also understood that the Governor is attempting to get certain Brooklyn members to defeat the bill, inasmuch as it does not now contain the provisions asked for by the Brooklyn builders.

WATERSTON'S PLATFORM.

NEW DEMOCRATIC ISSUES FOR 1904—GORMAN THE KENTUCKIAN'S CANDIDATE.

[BY TELEGRAPH TO THE TRIBUNE.] Washington, March 26.—It has developed that at the annual banquet in this city on Monday night of the Virginia Democratic Association Colonel Henry Waterston, of Kentucky, not only uttered a loud, fierce and piercing battle cry that is rallying the faithful of every quarter, but also was party to the most important platform of the party.

This platform was proposed by Colonel Waterston to the faithful after the formal exercises of the banquet were over, and at an hour in the morning when all the Democratic Democrats are supposed to be in a thoroughly enthusiastic and receptive mood. It consisted of only three planks, and while it is not the shortest Democratic platform ever enunciated, there can be claimed for it a merit that is not attached to most pronouncements of that party, to wit, terseness and clearness. Here is the platform as nearly as it can be reduced to print:

Resolved, first, That any Democrat who praises Cleveland, abuses Cleveland or discusses Cleveland is a traitor.

Resolved, second, That any Democrat who praises Cleveland, abuses Cleveland or discusses Cleveland is a traitor.

Resolved, third, That any Democrat who is not in favor of getting together for 1904 is a blankety blank.

It is unnecessary to state that Colonel Waterston's platform was adopted with a wild yell of unanimity that startled even the gallant Colonel himself, to say nothing of the ecstasy it reception caused him to feel. Particular importance is attached to the platform and the incidents which attended its adoption by the circumstance that the new chief of Tammany Hall, Lewis Nixon, was present and read each plank carefully and approvingly before the instrument was submitted to the banqueters for approval. It is also considered significant that efforts were made in vain to induce Chief Nixon to suggest a New-York candidate to fill the platform.

He resolutely refused to mention the name of any New-Yorker, either as a favor or as one on whom the party in the Empire State could be united. However, he did pledge himself to see to it that each plank of the Waterston platform is faithfully lived up to by every member of Tammany.

On the whole, it is believed that Colonel Waterston, who resents indignantly every intimation that he ever does anything on impulse without the most careful and painstaking consideration, had only one name in mind when he framed the platform, and that was the name of Arthur P. Gorman, of Maryland. While relations in times past between Colonel Waterston and Mr. Gorman have not been of the pleasantest character, because of the Kentucky gentleman's accusation that the State of Kentucky was a "free trade" country, with that courtesy and courtesy demanded by every true Kentucky gentleman, still it is understood that Mr. Gorman has apologized the only amendment any gentleman can make in such a case—and that now they are